

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/797,194	Applicant(s) OHKAWA, SATOSHI	
	Examiner Tia Carter	Art Unit 2626	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kimberly A. Williams.

(3) Ed Tracy.

(2) Mark Wallerson.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 24 January 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,5,7,10,14,15,17 and 18.

Identification of prior art discussed: Matsubayashi (US 6459419) Kanno et al. (US 6434266).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


KIMBERLY WILLIAMS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Tracy emphasized that claims 1 and 10 recite conversion of an input color to a plane and Claims 5,7,14 and 15 recite conversion of an image signal of a color space to an image signal on a plane (i.e., vector). The prior art is believed to teach characterizing the pixels using points and using a plurality of comparisons, as opposed to the present invention which keeps the data all together. Similar comments will be reflected in the remarks, upon which the examiner will reconsider the references.